

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rateek Allah, a/k/a Rateek Love Allah,  
a/k/a Lincoln Moody, a/k/a Jose, a/k/a  
Antonio Espinoza,

vs.  
Petitioner,

Warden of Estill,

Respondent.

Civil Action No.: 9:16-251-BHH

**Opinion and Order**

This matter is before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation ("Report") (ECF No. 10), which recommends that the § 2241 petition be dismissed *without prejudice* and without requiring the respondent to file a return. For the reasons set forth below, the Court agrees with the Report and dismisses the petition *without prejudice*.

**BACKGROUND**

Petitioner, Rateek Allah, a federal prisoner confined at Federal Correctional Institution Estill, who is proceeding *pro se*, brought this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging his "unconstitutional sentence." As set forth in greater detail in the Report, Petitioner contends that a juvenile conviction for robbery used to enhance his sentence from 27-31 months to 17.5 to 20 years as a career offender, violated his due process rights. Petitioner seeks to be resentenced without the use of the prior conviction. (ECF No. 1.)

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d) (D.S.C.), the case was assigned to Magistrate Judge Bristow Marchant. On May 9, 2016, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the § 2241 petition be

dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return. Petitioner has filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on May 26, 2016.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the district court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the district court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, the Court need not conduct a *de novo* review when a party makes only “general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982) (“[D]e novo review [is] unnecessary in . . . situations when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendation.”). Furthermore, in the absence of a timely filed, specific objection, the Magistrate Judge’s conclusions are reviewed only for clear error. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005).

After a careful review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 10) by reference into this

order. It is therefore ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED *without prejudice* and without requiring Respondent to file a return.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

July 29, 2016  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.